DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 827 EC 042 414

TITLE	Evaluation of the 1970-71 ESEA, Title VI-A, Cued Speech Program for Aurally Handicapped Children.
INSTITUTION	Gallaudet Coll., Washington, D.C.; Sacramento City Unified School District, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	18p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Aurally Handicapped; *Cued Speech; Early Childhood Education; Educational Programs; *Exceptional Child Research; Language Development; *Nonprofessional Personnel; Preschool Children; Primary Grades; *Program Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

Reported was program effectiveness for a cued speech program for aurally handicapped children in nursery and primary classes. Project objectives were explained to be training teachers and tutors (paraprofessionals) of the classes for the aurally handicapped and the parents of the pupils enrolled in the techniques of cued speech and to employ these techniques with children in nursery and primary levels. Participating were 15 teachers, 10 tutors, 60 children, and a limited number of parents. During the first year of the project, three areas of cued speech training were emphasized: development of vocabulary lists from which an instrument was designed to assess language acquisition by the children in receptive and expressive areas; training of all staff members in cued speech method of teaching language; and classes conducted for parents and other interested groups. The data regarding the language development of the children showed that receptive and expressive language acquisition could be measured with the test instrument developed and that these data clearly indicated the child's language growth. It was concluded that for cued speech to serve children to the greatest degree possible, more parents needed to participate in the program. (CB)

SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

ED 064827

June 7, 1971

Research Report No. 23
Series 1970-71
Topic: EVALUATION OF THE 1970-71 ESEA, TITLE VI-A, CUED SPEECH PROGRAM FOR AURALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Introduction

During the 1969-70 school year, the Sacramento City Unified School District developed a project to train teachers, tutors, parents, family members, and other interested persons in the use of Cued Speech, a new method of communication for the aurally handicapped (deaf and hard-of-hearing). This project was submitted for funding under Title VI-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The project was approved and funds were awarded for the 1970-71 school year.

Cued Speech is a reinforced oral method of communication for use with and by the aurally handicapped. The technique was developed by Dr. R. Orin Cornett at Gallaudet College in Washington, D. C., in 1967. Cued Speech is designed to reduce the degree by which the language learning process of the aurally handicapped child differs from that of the normal child. When the aurally handicapped depend on lipreading alone, many sounds in the English language are invisible, such as "g" and "k;" or, look alike, such as "p," "b," and "m." Cued Speech provides visual cues through handshapes and body locations to distinguish among sounds that are ambiguous or invisible. The cues alone are meaningless, and the lips alone are indefinite--together they offer a clearly readable phonetic analog of the spoken word.

If Cued Speech is introduced early, and the aurally handicapped child becomes proficient in reading Cued Speech, it is anticipated that he will be able to absorb the spoken language much in the same progressive way that language is assimilated by the hearing child. Through Cued Speech he shares with the hearing child the advantages of accelerated vocabulary growth, sophisticated sentence patterns and rhythmic speech. He will be thinking in the visual equivalent of spoken English and will be able to build upon his own daily achievement in an independent, meaningful way.

Description of the Program

This training program, conducted by the Staff Training Services Department of the Personnel Services Office, is designed to provide for transition to the use of Cued Speech by the teachers and pupils in the classes for the aurally handicapped, and to expand and extend the use of Cued Speech into the homes of aurally handicapped pupils.

During the fall semester, the teachers of the aurally handicapped met for ten three-hour sessions to learn the techniques and methods of Cued Speech, and to develop minimum vocabulary lists to be used at the nursery and primary levels. In addition, five full-day sessions were scheduled for the teachers to increase their proficiency and to develop materials. Throughout the year, the teachers continued their training on an individualized basis using video tape recordings

EC 042 414

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Description of the Program (continued)

and films. Instruments designed to assess cueing accuracy and quality were employed to measure progress and assist in the training. Fourteen teachers participated in this program. In addition, ten paraprofessional tutors were trained in the use of Cued Speech, six of whom were college students majoring in speech pathology, and four were parents. These people served in the classes for the aurally handicapped and worked with children on an individual basis.

Although Cued Speech is designed for increased and improved communication by the aurally handicapped, it will be most successful if learned and used by as many people as possible in the child's environment. Therefore, an in-depth training program for parents and interested community members was conducted in both day and evening sessions. Following the initial training session, the parents met weekly in order to improve skills and to discuss the application of Cued Speech in the home. Approximately 60% of the parents of pupils in the project participated in this training. In addition, teachers visited the homes and parents were encouraged to visit the classes in the schools.

Cued Speech was employed in seven nursery (three, four and five year olds) and three primary classes for the aurally handicapped. Approximately 60 children were enrolled in these 10 classes. Staffing for the project included the following: a certificated teacher of the deaf who served as the project director, a speech and hearing specialist, 10 program tutors (two hours per day), a demonstration teacher for audio visual services, a consulting audiologist (by contract), and a half-time clerk.

An audiologist was retained on a consulting basis to consider such areas as the acoustical environment in the schools which house the programs for aurally handicapped children, evaluation of district-owned auditory training equipment, evaluation of each child's wearable hearing aid, ear inserts for use with district equipment, and evaluation of children's performance with hearing aid amplification. The findings of the audiologist were made available to the project staff along with his conclusions and recommendations.

Objectives

The primary purposes of this project were: (1) to train teachers and tutors (paraprofessionals) of the classes for the aurally handicapped and the parents of the pupils enrolled in these classes in the techniques of Cued Speech, and (2) to employ these techniques with children in the nursery (three, four and five year olds) and primary classes for the aurally handicapped. The project called for the training of 15 teachers, 10 tutors, and as many parents and community members as possible. The techniques were employed with approximately 60 children enrolled in 10 nursery and primary classes for the aurally handicapped. More specifically, the objectives of the project were stated in performance terms as follow:

A. To compile vocabulary lists of single words, phrases, and short sentences appropriate to each age group (nursery and primary) to be used as the bases for the introduction of the Cued Speech method to the aurally handicapped children enrolled in the designated classes in the Sacramento City Unified School District.

Objectives (continued)

B. To train all teachers of aurally handicapped classes to a degree of 90% accuracy in cueing the vocabulary list appropriate to her age group.

C. To train each child in the acquisition of receptive and expressive vocabulary through the use of Cued Speech.

1. 75% of the children in the designated classes should attain a degree of 75% accuracy on reception of the appropriate vocabulary list when presented using Cued Speech.

2. 60% of the children in the designated classes should attain a degree of 50% accuracy on expression of the appropriate vocabulary list using Cued Speech.

D. To train each tutor to a degree of 75% accuracy in cueing the vocabulary list appropriate to the age group of the children she is tutoring.

E. To give each parent the opportunity to learn Cued Speech in order to improve communication within the family and provide a means of extending the total time during each day in which a consistent method of speech is presented to each child.

Evaluation Strategy

Evaluation plans were designed to assess the success of the project in terms of the degrees of achievement of the stated performance objectives. These plans were as follow:

A. The degree of achievement of Objective A, the compilation of vocabulary lists, was assessed in terms of the existence of such lists at the end of the school year. The Research and Development Services Office made no attempt to judge the "appropriateness" of these lists but relied on the judgment of the project personnel.

B. The degree of achievement of Objective B, teacher accuracy in cueing the vocabulary, was assessed by the demonstration teacher and/or the speech and hearing specialist assigned to the project. The final assessments were made in May of 1971 through the use of video tape. A checklist was employed to record teacher performance in cueing the vocabulary. Interim assessments were made in February of 1971 to monitor progress toward this objective.

C. The degree of achievement of Objective C, pupil reception and expression of the vocabulary lists, were assessed by the speech and hearing specialist. The final assessments were made in May of 1971 through individual testing. Baseline assessments were made in October of 1970 and interim assessments were made in February of 1971 to monitor progress toward this objective and to monitor pupil progress in the reception and expression of the vocabulary lists. A checklist was employed to record pupil performance.

Evaluation Strategy (continued)

A further measure of the efficacy of the Cued Speech technique was gained by testing the pupils on two word lists with and without Cued Speech. The pupils in two classes were tested on each of the two lists with and without Cued Speech with the sequence of testing alternated. An analysis of variance of the mean scores with and without Cued Speech was employed to determine the significance of any differences in the means.

D. The degree of achievement of Objective D, tutor accuracy in cueing the vocabulary, was assessed by the demonstration teacher and/or the speech and hearing specialist assigned to the project. The final assessments were made in May of 1971 through the use of video tape. A checklist was employed to record tutor performance in cueing the vocabulary. Interim assessments were made in February of 1971 to monitor progress toward this objective.

E. Subjective opinions were collected from participating parents in November, 1970, February, 1971, and May, 1971, to assess pupil growth in communicative ability in the home situation (Exhibit A).

Findings

The findings of this report are organized into five sections corresponding to the five performance objectives stated earlier in this report (see Page 2).

A. Compilation of Vocabulary Lists

During the in-service education workshops, the project staff and the teachers of the aurally handicapped compiled vocabulary lists containing single words, phrases, and short sentences for each of the six instructional levels: nursery, N-1, N-2, and N-3; and primary, P-1, P-2, and P-3. These lists were utilized throughout the year in the introduction of Cued Speech. They contained a sampling of appropriate items and were not and should not be considered as maximum or minimum lists for language development. These lists will be refined further for use during the 1971-72 school year, and an additional list will be developed to extend beyond level P-3.

B. Teacher Performance

Throughout the 1970-71 school year, 14 teachers were given training in the use of Cued Speech. In February of 1971 and May of 1971, the teachers were assessed in terms of their proficiency in cueing words, phrases, and sentences. An observational system was developed for this purpose.

Twenty-five items were selected at random from the vocabulary lists developed for the project. These items then were screened to ensure that they included all of the necessary handshapes, body locations, and other critical rules in cueing as well as the major problem areas. The teachers then cued these twenty-five items with their responses recorded on video tape. These tapes were viewed by members of the

Findings (continued)

project staff using a weighted observation scale designed to consider proficiency in six areas: position of hand, handshape, body location, synchronization, range, and rhythmic phrasing.

The weighting was based upon the importance of the skill, thus each correct item in the most important areas, handshape and body location, received a weight of four. Position of the hand and synchronization were considered refinements, and each correct response in these areas received a weight of two. Range and rhythmic phrasing were considered still further refinements, and each correct response was assigned a weight of one. The total weighted score possible then was 350, and teachers scoring 315 or higher were judged to have attained 90% accuracy.

The weighted scores for each of the teachers for February and May of 1971 are presented below:

	Weighted Cueing Score		% Accuracy
Teacher	February - 1971	May - 1971	May - 1971
A	270	314	89.7
B	300	342	97.7
C	249	319	91.1
D	241	316	90.3
E	214	318	90.9
F	295	343	98.0
G	267	329	94.0
H	239	310	88.6
I	237	324	92.6
J	299	339	96.9
K	300	342	97.7
L	214	274	78.3
M	211	292	83.4
N	254	305	87.1

These data indicate that all of the teachers with the exception of one reached a level of accuracy of 83.4% or higher, and 9 of the 14 teachers reached a level of 90.3% or higher.

Three of the five teachers who did not achieve 90% accuracy or higher in cueing had only one-half as much individualized training time as the rest of the group. This was due to a number of factors, including: breakdown of video equipment, difficulty in obtaining training space, and an overloaded training schedule.

C. Pupil Performance

1. Vocabulary lists

Pupils in the 10 classes were tested on the acquisition of receptive and expressive vocabulary by means of the vocabulary lists appropriate to their performance levels. Pre-assessments were made in October of 1970, and the post-assessments were made

in May of 1971. Interim assessments were made in February of 1971 to monitor pupil progress during the first semester.

Table I summarizes the October, 1970, assessment, and May, 1971, objectives. The October assessments were made to establish a base line and a working language level for each pupil on which the individualized lessons given by the tutors were based. From November to May, each pupil was scheduled for 120 individual, 15 minute training sessions. The May assessments were recorded as the last level completed with 75% accuracy for receptive vocabulary and 50% accuracy for expressive vocabulary. All pupils to the right of the heavy, broken line have achieved or exceed the expectations stated in Objective C.

It should be noted that level PreN-1 does not represent an actual level, but is a term used to cateorgize pupils whose achievement fell below level N-1.

These data indicate that 77.6% of the pupils achieved or exceeded the accuracy expectations in receptive vocabulary, and 75.9% of the pupils achieved or exceeded the accuracy expectations in expressive vocabulary. Both of these percentages exceeded the expected percentages: 75% of the children would attain 75% accuracy on receptive language, and 60% of the children would attain 50% accuracy on expression.

2. Testing with and without Cued Speech

The test results for the pupils tested with and without Cued Speech are presented below in summary form along with summary data from the analysis of variance. These data indicate that the pupils performed significantly better when tested with Cued Speech, there was no significant difference between the two classes, and that there was no significant interaction between the two variables: class placement and method of testing.

MEAN SCORES

	Testing With Cued Speech	Testing Without Cued Speech
Class A	7.57	6.14
Class B	10.00	5.57

F - Ratios

Method of Testing	15.282 ($P < .01$)
Class Placement	1.536 (NS)
Interaction	4.009 (NS)

D. Tutor Performance

Tutor proficiency in cueing was assessed by means of the same observation system discussed above for the teachers. The weighted scores for the tutors for February and May of 1971 are presented on the following page:

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF RECEPTIVE AND EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE PERFORMANCE LEVELS
IN OCTOBER OF 1970 AND MAY OF 1971
FOR PUPILS PARTICIPATING IN THE CUED SPEECH PROJECT

RECEPTIVE LANGUAGE PERFORMANCE

Last Level Completed October 1970	Number of Pupils	Number of Pupils Last Level Completed With 75% Accuracy in May of 1971							Percent Achieving Objective or Beyond Objective
		PreN-1	N-1	N-2	N-3	P-1	P-2	P-3	
Pre N-1	30	10	18	1	1				66.7
N-1	6		1	1	3	1			83.3
N-2	6			2	2	2			66.7
N-3	3					2		1	100.0
P-1	10						3	7	100.0
P-2	3							3	100.0
Total	58	10	19	4	6	5	3	11	77.6

EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE PERFORMANCE

Last Level Completed October 1970	Number of Pupils	Number of Pupils Last Level Completed with 50% Accuracy in May of 1971							Percent Achieving Objective or Beyond Objective
		PreN-1	N-1	N-2	N-3	P-1	P-2	P-3	
Pre N-1	30	11	18		1				53.3
N-1	5		1	2	1	1			80.0
N-2	7			1	4	2			85.7
N-3	3				1	1		1	66.7
P-1	7						3	4	100.0
P-2	6							6	100.0
Total	58	11	19	3	7	4	3	11	75.9

Findings (continued)

Tutor	Weighted Cueing Score February - 1971	Weighted Cueing Score May - 1971	% Accuracy May - 1971
A	272	312	89.1
B	308	328	93.7
C	315	326	93.1
D	274	298	85.1
E	177	290	82.9
F	274	308	88.0
G	302	306	87.4
H	271	286	81.7

These data indicate that all of the tutors reached a level of accuracy of 81.7% or higher in cueing which exceeded the expectation of 75% accuracy.

E. Parent Training

Throughout the 1970-71 school year, 92 parents and/or family members of families with aurally handicapped children participated in the classes operated to train parents and others in the use of Cued Speech. Of these 92 participants, 69 represented families of children in the project, and the remaining 23 represented families of other children in this district and other districts. In addition to the 92 parents, 7 teachers, 13 speech therapists, 10 college students from Sacramento State College, and 16 others participated in these classes. Thus a total of 138 people received some degree of training in the use of Cued Speech.

A "Cued Speech Parent Evaluation Schedule" (see Exhibit A) was adapted for use by the parents in evaluating this phase of the project and the use of Cued Speech in general. However, due to attendance problems, and parents not attending the training sessions for extended periods of time, limited data were collected in this regard.

Only three parents completed the schedule at all three assessment points: October, 1970, February, 1971, and May, 1971. Four other parents completed the schedule in February, 1971, and May, 1971, and two parents completed the schedule in October, 1970, and February, 1971. In addition, eight parents completed the schedule only in October of 1970, and nine parents completed the form only in February of 1971.

The following items were selected from the eight schedules completed by the parents in May of 1971, to present some indication of the parents' reaction of the impact of this project on their children.

1. Item 6

Five (62.5%) of the parents reported that their children were able to speechread more effectively.

Findings (continued)

2. Item 7

   Five (62.5%) of the parents indicated that their children were acquiring vocabulary more rapidly.

3. Item 8

   Four (50.0%) of the parents reported that their children were better able to retain vocabulary.

4. Item 9

   Five (62.5%) of the parents indicated that their children were interested in attempting to speak more.

5. Item 10

   Seven (87.5%) of the parents reported that Cued Speech is enabling their deaf children to pronounce words more accurately.

6. Item 11

   Four (50.0%) of the parents indicated that their children rely more on verbal language as a means of communication.

7. Item 12

   Three (37.5%) of the parents reported that Cued Speech had enabled their deaf children to rely on verbal language as their primary means of communication.

Summary and Conclusions

The data presented in this report indicate that this project has been successful generally, both from the standpoint of training professional and paraprofessional personnel in the use of Cued Speech and from the standpoint of the language development of the children. The first year of this project emphasized three areas of Cued Speech training. First, vocabulary lists were developed, and from these an instrument was designed to assess the language acquisition by deaf and hard-of-hearing children in both the receptive and expressive areas. Individualized lessons at the appropriate language level were constructed for tutor presentation. Secondly, all staff members were trained in the Cued Speech method of teaching language. Finally, classes were conducted for parents and other interested persons. The data regarding the language development of the children indicate that receptive and expressive language acquisition can be measured with the instrument developed, and such data give a clear indication of each child's language growth.

Those parents who participated in the training regularly are supportive of the project and the benefits their children have received. However, it was difficult to encourage more than a limited number of parents to take advantage of this training. If Cued Speech is to serve children to the greatest degree possible, it would seem that it should become a part of communication at home, as well as

Summary and Conclusions (continued)

in school. This ideal cannot be easily reached since parent participation cannot be deemed mandatory. However, lack of parent participation does not lessen the importance of using an effective method of teaching at school.

Recommendations

On the basis of the data presented in this report, it is recommended that:

A. Efforts be made for all teachers to maintain and/or improve their cueing accuracy.

B. Efforts be made to restructure the parent training in such a way as to include aspects of parent education necessary for parents of aurally handicapped children. By including these features as well as Cued Speech instruction, it may be possible to gain a higher level of parent participation.

C. Assessment and evaluation of the pupils' language acquisition be continued, using the instrument developed, in order to gather more data on each pupil and further refine the evaluation instrument.

D. Plans be formulated to assess receptive language with and without Cued Speech on a larger group of children than was possible during this project year.

Keith E. Hartwig
Director
Educational Evaluation and
Quality Control Department

Approved:
Frank E. Delavan
Assistant Superintendent
Research and Development Services Office

KEH:rk

EXHIBIT A

CUED SPEECH

PARENT EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Developed by: Cued Speech Program
Gallaudet College
Kendall Green
Washington, D. C. 20002

Adapted under: Title VI-A, E.S.E.A., Cued Speech
Staff Training Services Department
Sacramento City Unified School District
P. O. Box 2271
Sacramento, California 95810

NAME: _____

Cued Speech Parent Evaluation Schedule

Before making your final choice of response for any particular question asked, read all possibilities carefully. For each of the following questions please choose the response that best represents your feelings or situation and answer as objectively and as completely as possible.

Take as much time as is needed to complete the Evaluation Schedule. The information you provide will be kept in confidence and any compilations or reports will avoid identification of individuals. If you have any questions, please ask the proctor now.

1. What is your relationship to deaf children?
   - ___ Parent of deaf child(ren)
   - ___ Grandparent of deaf child(ren)
   - ___ Friend of deaf child(ren)
   - ___ Brother or sister of deaf child(ren)
   - ___ Other

2. For what length of time have you been using Cued Speech?
   - ___ Less than six months
   - ___ Six months to a year
   - ___ A year to a year and one half
   - ___ A year and one half to two years
   - ___ More than two years

3. Through which of the following is Cued Speech being implemented in your situation?
   - ___ Specific teachers
   - ___ School policy
   - ___ Parental usage
   - ___ Teacher and parent efforts
   - ___ School, teacher, and parental efforts

4. Which of the following characterize your training in Cued Speech (check as many as are applicable)?
   - ___ Self-taught through materials provided by Cued Speech Program (Please check which: ( ) films, ( ) written materials, ( ) records)
   - ___ Trained by a parent or teacher from your school
   - ___ Trained through a workshop conducted by Cued Speech staff at your school

5. To what extent is Cued Speech currently being used (check as many as are applicable)?
   - ___ To some extent by the teacher(s)
   - ___ To some extent by the parent(s)
   - ___ To some extent in both the school and home(s)
   - ___ To a considerable extent in the school
   - ___ To a considerable extent in the home(s)
   - ___ To a considerable extent in both home(s) and school

The following questions refer to the deaf children with whom you are associated as indicated in question 1, page 2.

6. Since the introduction of Cued Speech to your child(ren), do you feel it has enabled them to speechread more effectively?
   - ___ No
   - ___ I don't think so
   - ___ Uncertain
   - ___ I think so
   - ___ Yes

7. Since the introduction of Cued Speech to your child(ren), has there been any evidence to suggest that he (they) acquires vocabulary more rapidly?
   - ___ No
   - ___ I don't think so
   - ___ Uncertain
   - ___ I think so
   - ___ Yes

8. Since the introduction of Cued Speech in your situation, do you feel that your child(ren) has been better able to retain vocabulary?
   - ___ No
   - ___ I don't think so
   - ___ Uncertain
   - ___ I think so
   - ___ Yes

9. Since the introduction of Cued Speech to your child(ren), do you feel it has interested them in attempting to speak more?
   - ___ No
   - ___ I don't think so
   - ___ Uncertain
   - ___ I think so
   - ___ Yes

10. Has there been any evidence to suggest that Cued Speech is enabling the deaf child(ren) to pronounce words more accurately?
   - ___ Detrimental evidence
   - ___ No evidence
   - ___ Uncertain
   - ___ Some evidence
   - ___ Strong evidence

11. Since the introduction of Cued Speech to your child(ren), do you feel that it has caused him (them) to rely more on verbal (spoken) language as a means of communication?
   - ___ No
   - ___ I don't think so
   - ___ Uncertain
   - ___ I think so
   - ___ Yes

12. Do you feel that Cued Speech has generally enabled your deaf child(ren) to rely on verbal (spoken) language as his (their) primary means of communication?

___ No
___ I don't think so
___ Uncertain
___ I think so
___ Yes

13. Do you feel that for Cued Speech to be truly effective it is necessary to use it 100% of the time?

___ Strongly disagree
___ Disagree
___ Uncertain
___ Agree
___ Strongly agree

14. What type of training in the usage of Cued Speech (i.e. ability to cue) has your deaf child(ren) had (check as many as are applicable)?

___ None
___ Informal encouragement by the teacher
___ Informal encouragement by the parent
___ Formal training by the teacher
___ Formal training by the parent
___ I don't know

15. Does your deaf child(ren) cue as a means of communication?

___ No
___ On certain words only
___ Makes a general effort to cue without much accuracy
___ Cues several words accurately and attempts other words
___ Generally uses cuing as the method of communication

16. Does your child(ren) use Cued Speech to communicate with other deaf children?

___ No
___ Doesn't cue
___ Uncertain (I don't know)
___ Uses it some
___ Uses it considerably

17. Do you use Cued Speech yourself?

___ No
___ Yes

If no, please do not answer any more questions.

18. What percentage of your total communication time with your child(ren) involves the use of Cued Speech?

___ 20% of the time or less
___ 21-40% of the time
___ 41-60% of the time
___ 61-80% of the time
___ Greater than 80% of the time

19. Which of the following categories would best characterize your communication with your child(ren) involving the use of Cued Speech?

___ Used occasionally in structured situations
___ Used occasionally in informal situations
___ Used occasionally in both structured and informal situations
___ Used considerably in structured situations
___ Used considerably in informal situations
___ Used considerably in both structured and informal situations

20. When you are cuing at home, do you generally cue:

___ Single words
___ Phrases
___ Sentences

21. Which of the following examples characterize your use of Cued Speech in the home (check as many as are applicable)?

___ Explanation of occurrences; past, present, and future
___ Everyday family conversations
___ Storybook reading
___ Explanation of T.V. programs
___ Explanations while shopping
___ Explanations while traveling
___ Directions to the child (i.e. go to bed, drink your milk, etc.)
___ Disciplining the child
___ Formal lessons
___ Other (please specify) _____

22. Which of the following represent problems you are currently facing in your use of Cued Speech (check as many as are applicable)?

___ Getting and/or keeping deaf child's attention
___ Getting deaf child to cue
___ Getting spouse to cue
___ Getting other children to cue
___ Using Cued Speech at the normal conversational rate
___ Using Cued Speech the majority of the time
___ Inconsistent usage in the school
___ Feeling ill-at-ease when using Cued Speech outside the home
___ Lack of confidence concerning the use of Cued Speech
___ Lack of interest among other parents to encourage cuing
___ Insufficient training in the usage of Cued Speech
___ Lack of conviction regarding Cued Speech by teachers
___ Haven't used Cued Speech enough to answer
___ Other (please specify) _____

23. Do both parents of the family use Cued Speech?

___ Yes
___ No
___ Not applicable

24. (a) Do any of your children other than your deaf child(ren) use Cued Speech in any way?

___ Yes
___ No
___ Not applicable (no other children)

24. (b) If so, how many cue?

___ one
___ two
___ three
___ four
___ five or more

(c) Which of the following would best characterize their cuing ability?

___ Cue names and single words occasionally
___ Cue names and single words frequently
___ Cue phrases occasionally
___ Cue phrases frequently
___ Cue sentences

25. In your opinion, the primary purpose of Cued Speech is to aid in the development of:

___ Speech
___ Lipreading (speechreading)
___ Reading
___ Language

26. In your opinion, Cued Speech has been most helpful to your child(ren) in the development of:

___ Speech
___ Lipreading (speechreading)
___ Reading
___ Language

SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Personnel Services Office
Staff Training Services
June 18, 1971

Program Report

This report presents reactions to the research report on the Evaluation of the 1970-71 ESEA, Title VI-A, Cued Speech Program for Aurally Handicapped Children prepared by the Research and Development Services Office.

Background

The 1970-71 Cued Speech Project was funded as a one year project. A proposal for a project for 1971-72 was submitted in March 1971 for funds to continue Cued Speech training of teachers, pupils, and parents and others in the community. While this project was recommended for funding as a good quality project, it was not funded because "Unfortunately, the funding level for Title VI-B will permit only a limited number of projects to be supported". Suggestions were made in the Review Team Consensus Report to assist in planning an application for 1972-73 funding.

The recommendations of the Research and Development Services Office will, therefore, be reacted to on the basis of the fact that funding has not been approved for 1971-72.

General Reaction

The report considered the project generally successful and this program report is in agreement with that statement. The one difficulty in the area of parent participation will be discussed under recommendations.

Recommendations

A. "Efforts to be made for all teachers to maintain and/or improve their cueing accuracy."

Reaction

Plans are being made for an in-service course and/or workshop during 1971-72 in order to give the aurally handicapped staff an opportunity to maintain and/or improve their cueing accuracy. However, it will not be possible to allow released time for this activity nor can attendance be made mandatory.

B. "Efforts be made to restructure the parent training in such a way as to include aspects of parent education necessary for parents of aurally handicapped children. By including these features, as well as Cued Speech instruction, it may be possible to gain a higher level of parent participation."

Reaction

Parent courses need to be organized for small groups of parents whose children have similar language needs. In this way, through the use

of in-service parent education courses, it is hoped that more parents will avail themselves of the opportunity to understand and to aid their children in the very difficult job of language acquisition. In defense of parents, they often want to do the right things for their aurally handicapped children. Many factors often prevent parents from active participation: the needs of siblings, lack of transportation, both parents employed, distance of residence from school facilities where classes can be held, and others. The effort to involve more parents must be continued, however difficult. Under the 1970-71 project the teachers were allowed released time and mileage to make at least four home visits to each child's home. This feature encouraged parent participation, but cannot be continued without funding.

C. "Assessment and evaluation of the pupils' language acquisition be continued, using the instrument developed, in order to gather more data on each pupil and further refine the evaluation instrument."

Reaction

The evaluation of the pupils' language acquisition has been most encouraging to staff and parents alike. While the 1970-71 project was not designed as a research project; and, therefore, no claims are being made that the children's progress was due to Cued Speech alone, it is felt that a cumulative record of each child's language growth will provide a focus of attention to this vital need of the aurally handicapped child.

D. "Plans be formulated to assess receptive language with and without Cued Speech on a larger group of children than was possible during this project year."

Reaction

A larger test sample with and without Cued Speech was attempted during 1970-71, but since one half of the project children were at K-1 language level or below on receptive language, it was not possible to obtain accurate responses to a test of homophenous words. However, as the children increase their vocabulary, it will be possible to test a larger group of children on homophenous words. The speech and hearing specialist plans to do this type of evaluation in May 1972.

Additional Comment

While the research report did not make a recommendation concerning the utilization of tutors for the individualized instruction of pupils, it is felt that some comments on this segment of the project are in order. While the lack of funds make it impossible to plan for the use of tutors during 1971-72, the project staff and teachers felt that the use of tutors during 1970-71 contributed significantly to the pupils' receptive and expressive language acquisition. It is planned to include this feature in any future proposal for funding.